arXiv:1608.07962v2 [nucl-th] 19 Oct 2016

Self-consistent account for phonon induced corrections to quadrupole moments of odd semi-magic nuclei

E E Saperstein[1,2], S Kamerdzhiev[1], D S Krepish[1,3], S V Tolokonnikov[1,3], and D Voitenkov[4]

[1]National Research Centre "Kurchatov Institute", 123182 Moscow, Russia
[2]National Research Nuclear University MEPhI, 115409 Moscow, Russia
[3]Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, 141700 Dolgoprudny, Russia
[4]Institute for Physics and Power Engineering, 249033 Obninsk, Russia

E-mail: saper43_7@mail.ru, kaevster@gmail.com, krepish@phystech.edu, tolkn@mail.ru, voitenkov@list.ru

Abstract. A self-consistent model is developed within the theory of finite Fermi systems to describe phonon coupling (PC) effects in moments of odd magic and semi-magic nuclei. The model is based on the perturbation theory in g_L^2, where g_L is the vertex of creating the L-phonon. The phonon tadpole diagrams are taken into account in an approximate way, which turns out to be exact for the spurious 1^- phonon. The calculation scheme is based on the Fayans energy density functional DF3-a and does not contain any adjusted parameters. The odd In and Sb are considered, which are the proton-odd neighbors of even tin nuclei. The 2_1^+ phonon is taken into account which is the most collective among the low-laying surface states. Its quadrupole moment is one of ingredients of the calculation scheme, with the corresponding values being found by us previously. The value of total PC correction to quadrupole moments turned out to be moderate due to strong cancelation of two main terms, due to the phonon Z-factor and due to the phonon-induced interaction. However, as a rule, the resulting PC correction is noticeable, making the overall agreement with the data significantly better.

1. Introduction

In the self-consistent nuclear theory based on the energy density functional (EDF) method, a trend appeared last decade to go beyond the mean field approximation. In spherical nuclei, it is usually described in terms of the particle-phonon coupling (PC) effects. Direct consideration of the PC corrections within the EDF method is a rather delicate problem as they are included, on average, to the EDF parameters. Thus, only a fluctuating part of such corrections to nuclear characteristics should be taken into account, if we do not want to readjust the EDF parameters.

Up to now, the self-consistent consideration of the PC corrections was limited mainly with such an object as single-particle energies (SPEs) in magic nuclei [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Different kinds of the self-consistent theories were used in the cited above References: the relativistic mean-field theory [6] in [1], the Skyrme-Hartree-Fock method [7] with various Skyrme EDFs in [2, 3, 5] and the Fayans EDF method [8, 9] in [4]. In all these cases, the PC corrections to the SPEs turned out to be rather moderate and it seemed reasonable to keep the parameters of the corresponding EDFs unchanged. Suffice it also to mention more recent considerations of the one-nucleon spectroscopic factors in semi-magic nuclei [10, 11] and the PC corrections to the *ab initio* double mass differences in magic nuclei [12, 13].

Recently, a model was developed [14, 15, 16] to find the PC corrections to magnetic moments of odd semi-magic nuclei within the self-consistent theory of finite Fermi systems (TFFS) [17]. This approach is based on the general principles of the TFFS [18] supplemented with the TFFS self-consistency relation [19]. The self-consistent basis DF3-a [20] was used, which is just a small modification of the initial Fayans EDF DF3 [9]. The modification concerns the spin-orbit and effective tensor terms of the EDF only. The main idea of this model was to separate and explicitly consider such PC diagrams that behave in a non-regular way, depending significantly on the nucleus and the single-particle state of the odd nucleon. The rest (and the major part) of the PC corrections is supposed to be regular and included in the initial EDF parameters. In this model, we deal with semi-magic nuclei, which contain two subsystems with absolutely different properties. Indeed, one of them is superfluid whereas the second subsystem is normal. The model is valid for nuclei with odd nucleon belonging to the non-superfluid subsystem. As it is shown in [14], in this case we can limit ourselves to the PC corrections to the diagrams in the normal subsystem only. It simplifies the problem drastically.

In this work we develop a similar model to quadrupole moments of odd semi-magic nuclei. We consider the odd-proton neighbors of the even tin nuclei, i.e. the odd isotopes of In and Sb. Their quadrupole moments were found previously within the self-consistent TFFS at the mean-field level in [21, 22, 23]. Only the lowest 2^+ phonon, which plays the main role in the PC corrections in these nuclei, is taken into account. One of the PC corrections contains the quadrupole moment of the phonon under consideration. The quadrupole moments of the 2^+_1 states in even Sn isotopes were found by us previously in a self-consistent way with the use of the DF3-a EDF in [24].

2. The model for PC corrections to quadrupole moments

Within the TFFS [18], quadrupole moments of odd nuclei are determined in terms of the diadonal matrix elements

$$Q_\lambda = \langle\lambda|V|\lambda\rangle_{m=j}, \tag{1}$$

$|\lambda\rangle$ being the state of the odd nucleon, of the normal component V of the effective field. In superfluid nuclei, we deal, the latter obeys the QRPA-like equation, which can be written in a compact form as

$$\hat{V}(\omega) = \hat{V}_0(\omega) + \hat{\mathcal{F}}\hat{A}(\omega)\hat{V}(\omega), \tag{2}$$

where all the terms are matrices. In the standard TFFS notation, we have:

$$\hat{V} = \begin{pmatrix} V \\ d_1 \\ d_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{V}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} e_q V_0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F} & \mathcal{F}^{\omega\xi} & \mathcal{F}^{\omega\xi} \\ \mathcal{F}^{\xi\omega} & \mathcal{F}^{\xi} & \mathcal{F}^{\xi\omega} \\ \mathcal{F}^{\xi\omega} & \mathcal{F}^{\xi\omega} & \mathcal{F}^{\xi} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

The matrix $\hat{A}$ consists of 3×3 integrals over ε of the products of different combinations of the Green function $G(\varepsilon)$ and two Gor'kov functios $F^{(1)}(\varepsilon)$ and $F^{(2)}(\varepsilon)$. They can be found, e. g., in [18].

Elements of the matrix (4) are different variation derivatives of the Fayans EDF depending on the normal ρ and anomalous ν densities:

$$E_0 = \int \mathcal{E}[\rho(\mathbf{r}), \nu(\mathbf{r})] d^3r. \tag{5}$$

They are:

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{\delta^2\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho^2};\ \mathcal{F}^{\omega\xi} = \mathcal{F}^{\xi\omega} = \frac{\delta^2\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho\delta\nu};\ \mathcal{F}^{\xi} = \frac{\delta^2\mathcal{E}}{\delta\nu^2}. \tag{6}$$

Here, $\mathcal{F}$ is the usual Landau–Migdal amplitude, whereas $\mathcal{F}^\xi$ is the effective paring interaction entering the gap equation. Isotopic indices in Eqs. (2-6) are omitted for brevity.

For the quadrupole moment problem we deal, one has $V_0(\mathbf{r}) = \sqrt{16\pi/5}\, r^2\, Y_{20}(\mathbf{n})$ $\times\, (1+\tau_3)/2$. The local charges e_q are trivial in this case: $e_q^p = 1,\ e_q^n = 0$, due to the Ward indentity [18].

Let us now consider the PC corrections to the matrix element (1) in the field $g_L(\mathbf{r})$ of the L-phonon: $|\lambda\rangle \to |\tilde{\lambda}\rangle$ and $V \to \tilde{V}$, with obvious notation. We follow the scheme of [14] and limit ourselves to the g_L^2-approximation. We consider the ground state of the odd nucleus without phonons, therefore the first order corrections $\delta_L^{(1)}$ to any observable vanish. Thus, the second order variations $\delta_L^{(2)}$ of each element of Eq. (1) appear, and mixed $\delta_L^{(1)}$ variations of two different elements of this formula contribute also. The main



Figure 1. A diagram of the "end" correction. The gray triangle is the effective field V without PC corrections, and the horizontal slab denotes the variation $\delta\Sigma$ of the mass operator induced by the L-phonon.



Figure 2. PC corrections to the mass operator. The open blob is the L-phonon creation amplitude $g_L(\mathbf{r})$, and the wavy line denotes the phonon D-function. The dashed blob denotes the "tadpole" term $\delta\Sigma^{\rm tad}$.

idea of the model developed in [14] is to separate such PC corrections which behave in a non-regular way depending significantly on the phonon excitation energy ω_L and on the state $|\lambda\rangle$ under consideration. From this point of view, as the analysis of [14] shows, the mixed term with $\delta_L^{(1)}|\lambda\rangle$ and $\delta_L^{(1)}V$ can be omitted, whereas those containing two corrections $\delta_L^{(1)}|\lambda\rangle$ of different states λ in (1) are very important.

Let us begin from the term of $\delta_L^{(2)}|\lambda\rangle$, the "end correction". It is displayed in Fig. 1, where $\delta\Sigma^L$ denotes the g_L^2 correction to the mass operator $\Sigma(\varepsilon;\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2)$. Of course, the same diagram exists for the left end. The term $\delta\Sigma^L$ is displayed in Fig. 2. The first term is the usual pole diagram whereas the second, tadpole, term represents the sum of all non-pole diagrams proportional to g_L^2.

Below we simplify the notation as follows $\delta^{(2)} \to \delta$. In semi-magic nuclei, the L-phonon creation amplitude $\hat{g}_L$ is the 3-vector containing the normal component $g_L^{(0)}$ and two anomalous ones, $g_L^{(1,2)}$. It obeys the QRPA-like equation, the homogeneous counterpart of Eq. (2):

$$\hat{g}_L(\omega) = \hat{\mathcal{F}}\hat{A}(\omega)\hat{g}_L(\omega). \tag{7}$$

As it was demonstrated in [21, 22, 23, 24], the normal component is important only in the problem under consideration. The anomalous ones will be neglected below and the upper index will be omitted for brevity, $g_L^{(0)} \to g_L$. All the low-lying phonons we will consider have natural parity, hence the vertex g_L possesses even T-parity. It is a sum of two components with spins $S = 0$ and $S = 1$, respectively:

$$g_L = g_{L0}(r)T_{LL0}(\mathbf{n},\alpha) + g_{L1}(r)T_{LL1}(\mathbf{n},\alpha), \tag{8}$$

where T_{JLS} stand for the usual spin-angular tensor operators [25]. The operators T_{LL0} and T_{LL1} have opposite T-parities, hence the spin component should be an odd function



Figure 3. The induced interaction correction.



Figure 4. Correction due to the direct action of the $E2$-field to the phonon. The black blob is the quadrupole moment of the phonon.

of the excitation energy, $g_{L1} \propto \omega_L$. In all the cases we consider the 2^+_1 phonon excitation energy is small, $\omega_2 < 1$ MeV, and the $S = 1$ component can be neglected.

For the diagonal matrix element (1) of the effective field, the sum of these corrections corresponds to the following formula:

$$\delta V^{\rm end}_{\lambda\lambda} = -\sum_{\lambda'} V_{\lambda\lambda'} G_{\lambda'}(\varepsilon_\lambda) \delta\Sigma_{\lambda'\lambda}(\varepsilon_\lambda) - \sum_{\lambda'} \delta\Sigma_{\lambda\lambda'}(\varepsilon_\lambda) G_{\lambda'}(\varepsilon_\lambda) V_{\lambda'\lambda}. \qquad (9)$$

The tadpole term of $\delta\Sigma$ is rather essential in the problem of the PC corrections to the single-particle levels [26], but it does practically not contribute to the problem under consideration [14, 16], wherefore we do not consider it below.

The pole diagram in Fig. 2 leads to such well-known expression:

$$\delta\Sigma_{\lambda_2\lambda_1}(\epsilon) = \sum_{\lambda M} \langle\lambda_2|g^+_{LM}|\lambda\rangle\langle\lambda|g_{LM}|\lambda_1\rangle \left(\frac{n_\lambda}{\varepsilon + \omega_L - \varepsilon_\lambda} + \frac{1-n_\lambda}{\varepsilon - \omega_L - \varepsilon_\lambda}\right), \qquad (10)$$

where $n_\lambda = (0, 1)$ stands for the occupation numbers.

After substitution of (10) into (9) one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta V^{\rm end}_{\lambda\lambda} = &-\sum_{\lambda_1\lambda_2 M} \frac{V_{\lambda\lambda_1}\langle\lambda|g^+_{LM}|\lambda_2\rangle\langle\lambda_2|g_{LM}|\lambda_1\rangle}{\varepsilon_\lambda - \varepsilon_{\lambda_1}} \left(\frac{n_{\lambda_2}}{\varepsilon_\lambda + \omega_L - \varepsilon_{\lambda_2}} + \frac{1-n_{\lambda_2}}{\varepsilon_\lambda - \omega_L - \varepsilon_{\lambda_2}}\right) \\ &-\sum_{\lambda_1\lambda_2 M} \left(\frac{n_{\lambda_2}}{\varepsilon_\lambda + \omega_L - \varepsilon_{\lambda_2}} + \frac{1-n_{\lambda_2}}{\varepsilon_\lambda - \omega_L - \varepsilon_{\lambda_2}}\right) \frac{\langle\lambda_2|g^+_{LM}|\lambda_2\rangle\langle\lambda_2|g_{LM}|\lambda\rangle V_{\lambda_1\lambda}}{\varepsilon_\lambda - \varepsilon_{\lambda_1}}. \qquad (11)\end{aligned}$$

In this equation, the terms with $\lambda_1 = \lambda$ in both the sums are singular. This singularity is removed with the standard renormalization [17] of the single particle wave functions $|\lambda\rangle \to \sqrt{Z_\lambda}\,|\lambda\rangle$, where

$$Z_\lambda = \left(1 - \left.\frac{\partial\delta\Sigma_{\lambda\lambda}(\varepsilon)}{\partial\varepsilon}\right|_{\varepsilon=\varepsilon_\lambda}\right)^{-1} \qquad (12)$$



Figure 5. The tadpole-like diagram for the contribution of the phonon quadrupole moment.

is the residue of the Green function at the pole $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_\lambda$.

The rest of these sums with non-diagonal terms $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda$ can be calculated directly and is rather small [14, 16]. However, we retain it for completeness, and represent the "end correction" as the sum:

$$\delta V^{\rm end}_{\lambda\lambda} = \delta V^{Z}_{\lambda\lambda} + (\delta V^{\rm end}_{\lambda\lambda})', \tag{13}$$

where

$$\delta V^{Z}_{\lambda\lambda} = (Z_\lambda - 1)\, V_{\lambda\lambda}. \tag{14}$$

Eqs. (13), (14) correspond to partial summation of the diagrams of Fig. 1, and, hence, contain higher order terms in g_L^2. To be consistent up to the order g_L^2, the Z-factors in Eqs. (12) and (14) should be expanded in terms of $\partial\Sigma_{\lambda\lambda}(\varepsilon)/\partial\varepsilon$, $Z^{\rm ptb}_\lambda = 1+\partial\delta\Sigma_{\lambda\lambda}(\varepsilon)/\partial\varepsilon$, with the result

$$\left(\delta V^{Z}_{\lambda\lambda}\right)_{\rm ptb} = \left.\frac{\partial\delta\Sigma_{\lambda\lambda}(\varepsilon)}{\partial\varepsilon}\right|_{\varepsilon=\varepsilon_\lambda} V_{\lambda\lambda}. \tag{15}$$

The energy derivative of the mass operator (10) can be readily found.

Let us now go to the term with two first variations of the wave functions $|\lambda\rangle$ in (1). It corresponds to the "triangle" diagram (GGD) displayed in Fig. 3 which describes the effect of the induced interaction $\mathcal{F}_{\rm ind}$ due to the exchange of the L-phonon. Below we write explicitly the corresponding formula for the external field with symmetry $E2$:

$$\delta V^{GGD}_{\lambda\lambda} = (-1)^{j-m}\begin{pmatrix} j & 2 & j \\ -m & M & m \end{pmatrix} \langle\nu \parallel \delta V^{GGD} \parallel \nu\rangle, \tag{16}$$

with the reduced matrix element

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0 \parallel \delta V^{GGD} \parallel 0\rangle = \sum_{12}(-1)^{L+j_2-j_1}\begin{Bmatrix} 2 & j_0 & j_0 \\ L & j_2 & j_1 \end{Bmatrix} \\ \times\langle 2\parallel V\parallel 1\rangle\langle 0\parallel \tilde g_L\parallel 2\rangle\langle 1\parallel g_L\parallel 0\rangle I_{12}(\omega_L),\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

$$I_{12}(\omega_L) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2}\left[\frac{n_1}{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon_1+\omega_L}+\frac{1-n_1}{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon_1-\omega_L}-\frac{n_2}{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon_2+\omega_L}-\frac{1-n_2}{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon_2-\omega_L}\right], \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde g_L{=}g_L(-\omega)$,

$$\tilde g_L{=}g_{L0}(r;\omega)T_{LL0}(\mathbf{n},\alpha){-}g_{L1}(r;\omega)T_{LL1}(\mathbf{n},\alpha). \tag{19}$$

In Eqs. (17), (18) the short notation is used: $1 = \nu_1$,...

Let us now turn to the second order variation of the effective field V in Eq. (1). It is represented by the diagram of Fig. 4 describing the contribution of the phonon quadrupole moment. It can be obtained from the first diagram of Fig. 2 by inserting the external quadrupole field in the phonon line. In Fig. 4, the black blob means the phonon quadrupole moment $Q_L^{\rm ph}$. Analogously, the action of the $E2$ field to the phonon line in the second diagram in Fig. 2 results in the tadpole-like diagram displayed in Fig. 5.

Again, after separating the angular variables, we obtain

$$\delta V^{GDD}_{\lambda\lambda} = (-1)^{j-m} \begin{pmatrix} j & 2 & j \\ -m & M & m \end{pmatrix} \langle \nu \parallel \delta V^{GDD} \parallel \nu \rangle, \tag{20}$$

with the reduced matrix element

$$< 0 \parallel \delta V^{GDD} \parallel 0 > = \sum_1 (-1)^{L+j_0+j_1} Q_L^{\rm ph} \sqrt{\frac{L(L+1)(2L+1)}{4\pi}} \begin{Bmatrix} j_0 & 2 & j_0 \\ L & j_1 & L \end{Bmatrix}$$
$$\times \langle 1 \parallel g_L \parallel 0 \rangle \langle 0 \parallel \tilde{g}_L \parallel 1 \rangle \left(I_1^{(1)}(\omega_L) + I_1^{(2)}(\omega_L) \right), \tag{21}$$

$$I_1^{(1)}(\omega_L) = \frac{1-n_1}{(\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1 - \omega_L)^2} + \frac{n_1}{(\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1 + \omega_L)^2}, \tag{22}$$

$$I_1^{(2)}(\omega_L) = -\frac{1}{\omega_L} \left(\frac{n_1}{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1 + \omega_L} + \frac{1-n_1}{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1 - \omega_L} \right). \tag{23}$$

The second integral (23) reveals a dangerous behavior at $\omega_L \to 0$. The tadpole-like diagram on Fig. 5 possess a similar singularity [14, 16]. Let us denote the corresponding terms of (21) with (22) and (23) as $\delta V^{(1),(2)}_{GDD}$. An ansatz was proposed in the model under discussion how to deal with these two dangerious terms of δV_{GDD}. It was supposed that the term $\delta V^{(2)}_{GDD}$ and the tadpole one $\delta V_{\rm tad}$ cancel each other. Such cancelation does take place for the 'fictitious' external fields $V_0 = \mathbf{j}$ and $V_0 = 1$ providing the conservation of the total momentum of the system and the total particle number, correspondingly. In addition, this is true in the case of the spurious 1^- phonon. In the result, the total g_L^2 PC correction to the effective field becomes equal to

$$\delta V = \delta V^Z_{\rm ptb} + \delta V_{GGD} + \delta V^{(1)}_{GDD} + \delta V'_{\rm end}. \tag{24}$$

The final ansatz for the quadrupole moments with PC corrections is as follows:

$$\widetilde{V}_{\lambda\lambda} = Z_\lambda \left(V + \delta V_{GGD} + \delta V^{(1)}_{GDD} + \delta V'_{\rm end} \right)_{\lambda\lambda}. \tag{25}$$

Just as Eq. (12) *vs* Eq. (15), the ansatz (25) differs from the prescription of Eq. (24) in terms higher in g_L^2. It corresponds to making "fat" the ends in Figs. 3–5: $|\lambda\rangle \to \sqrt{Z_\lambda}\,|\lambda\rangle$. In Refs. [14, 16] it was used for magnetic moments of odd semi-magic nuclei. Here we apply this model to the quadrupole moments of odd In and Sb isotopes.

Table 1. Characteristics of the 2_1^+ phonons in even Sn isotopes, ω_2 (MeV) and $Q(2_1^+)$(b)

A	$\omega_2^{\rm th}$	$\omega_2^{\rm exp}$	$Q^{\rm th}$	$Q^{\rm exp}$
106	1.316	1.207	-0.34	-
108	1.231	1.206	-0.39	
110	1.162	1.212	-0.50	
112	1.130	1.257	-0.45	-0.03(11)
114	1.156	1.300	-0.28	0.32(3)
116	1.186	1.294	-0.12	-0.17(4)
118	1.217	1.230	-0.01	-0.05(14)
120	1.240	1.171	0.04	+0.022(10)
122	1.290	1.141	0.01	$< +0.14$
124	1.350	1.132	-0.07	0.0(2)
126	1.405	1.141	-0.13	
128	1.485	1.169	-0.14	

3. Calculation results for In and Sb isotopes

The self-consistent scheme of solving Eqs. (2) and (7) is described in detail in [21] and [22]. The DF3-a version [20] of the Fayans EDF is used. The excitation energies and quadrupole moments of 2_1^+ states in even Sn isotopes, which are ingredients of Eqs. (9)–(25), are presented in Table 1. They are taken from [21] and [24].

Table 2 represents different PC corrections to quadrupole moments discussed above. Here, the Z-factor, column 4, is found from its definition (12), whereas the perturbation theory prescription (15) is used for finding the $\delta Q^Z_{\rm ptb}$ values in column 5. Thus, the $\delta Q_{\rm ptb}$ quantity, Eq. (24), is just the sum of four partial corrections in previous columns. At last, the quantity in the last column is $\delta Q_{\rm ph} = \tilde{V} - V$ where $\tilde{V}$ is the result of the use of Eq. (25) which is the final prescription of the model we use. We see that two main corrections are those due to the Z-factor (column 5) and due to the induced interaction (the term δQ_{GGD}, column 6). They always possess different signs, the sum being significantly less in the absolute value than each of them. Therefore two other "small" corrections are sometimes also important. It is worth to mention that the Z-factor values are often about 0.5 which makes the use of the perturbation theory in g_L^2 questionable as the value of $(1-Z)$ is a measure of validity of the g_L^2 approximation. Eq. (25) we use contains higher in g_L^2 terms, but it is just an ansatz. The analysis shows that the g_L^2 approximation in semi-magic nuclei is valid on the average, but often one "dangerous" term appears in Eq. (10) with small energy denominator leading to a big contribution to the value of $(1-Z)$. Synchronically, the same small denominator contributes, with opposite sign, to Eq. (18) for the induced interaction correction. In the result, two inaccuracies compensate each other partially. However, a more consistent approach should be developed for the small denominator situation. Such development is in our nearest plans.

The final results are presented in Table 3 and Fig. 6. We see that the PC corrections

Table 2. Different PC corrections to the quadrupole moments of odd-proton In and Sb nuclei. Q is the quadrupole moment without PC corrections [22]. Other notation is explained in the text. All values, except Z, are in fm^2.

nucl.	λ	Q	Z	$\delta Q^Z_{\rm ptb}$	δQ_{GGD}	δQ_{GDD}	$\delta Q'_{\rm end}$	$\delta Q_{\rm ptb}$	$\delta Q_{\rm ph}$
^{105}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+83.3	0.675	-40.0	23.1	5.5	1.4	-10.0	-6.7
^{107}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+97.6	0.584	-69.2	40.4	9.4	2.1	-17.2	-10.0
^{109}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+111.3	0.573	-82.6	48.7	12.8	2.3	-18.8	-10.8
^{111}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+116.5	0.488	-122.0	72.2	16.3	3.4	-30.1	-14.7
^{113}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+111.7	0.576	-82.0	48.4	7.1	2.5	-24.0	-13.8
^{115}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+103.4	0.609	-66.2	38.9	2.6	2.3	-22.4	-13.6
^{117}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+96.3	0.632	-56.0	32.8	0.2	2.1	-20.9	-13.2
^{119}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+90.9	0.621	-55.3	32.3	-0.8	2.2	-21.6	-13.4
^{121}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+83.3	0.639	-46.5	27.1	-0.2	1.9	-17.7	-11.3
^{123}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+74.3	0.720	-28.9	16.8	0.9	1.1	-10.1	-7.3
^{125}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+66.3	0.738	-23.2	13.4	1.5	1.0	-7.3	-5.4
^{127}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+55.0	0.800	-13.8	7.9	1.2	0.6	-4.1	-3.3
^{115}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-88.2	0.551	71.7	-27.5	-2.5	5.3	47.0	25.9
^{117}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-81.7	0.582	58.8	-22.9	-0.9	5.0	39.9	23.2
^{119}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-76.3	0.602	50.4	-19.8	-0.1	4.8	35.3	21.3
^{121}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-72.1	0.591	49.7	-19.6	0.3	5.2	35.5	21.0
^{123}Sb	$1g_{7/2}$	-73.9	0.570	55.2	-32.8	0.1	9.9	32.3	18.4



Figure 6. (Color online) Quadrupole moments of odd In and Sb isotopes with and without PC corrections.

to quadrupole moments taken into account make agreement with experiment better almost always. In any case, this is true in all the cases where the deviation from experiment of the results without PC corrections is significant. For example, this is so

Table 3. Quadrupole moments Q (b) of odd In and Sb isotopes. The theoretical values are $Q_{\rm th}$ and $\tilde{Q}_{\rm th}$ without and with PC corrections, correspondingly. The differences $\delta Q = Q_{\rm th} - Q_{\rm exp}$ and $\delta\tilde{Q} = \tilde{Q}_{\rm th} - Q_{\rm exp}$ are given in the last two columns.

nucl.	λ	$Q_{\rm exp}$	$Q_{\rm th}$	$\tilde{Q}_{\rm th}$	δQ	$\delta\tilde{Q}$
^{105}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.83(5)	+0.83	0.76	0.00	-0.07
^{107}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.81(5)	+0.98	0.87	0.17	0.06
^{109}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.84(3)	+1.11	1.00	0.27	0.16
^{111}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.80(2)	+1.17	1.02	0.37	0.22
^{113}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.80(4)	+1.12	0.98	0.32	0.18
^{115}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.81(5)	+1.03	0.90	0.22	0.09
		0.58(9)			0.45	0.32
^{117}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.829(10)	+0.96	0.83	0.13	0.0
^{119}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.854(7)	+0.91	0.773	0.06	-0.081
^{121}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.814(11)	+0.833	0.711	0.019	-0.103
^{123}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.757(9)	+0.743	0.670	-0.014	-0.087
^{125}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.71(4)	+0.66	0.60	-0.05	-0.11
^{127}In	$1g_{9/2}$	+0.59(3)	+0.55	0.52	-0.04	-0.07
^{115}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-0.36(6)	-0.88	-0.62	-0.52	-0.26
^{117}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-	-0.817	-0.585		-
^{119}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-0.37(6)	-0.76	-0.55	-0.39	-0.18
^{121}Sb	$2d_{5/2}$	-0.36(4)	-0.72	-0.51	-0.36	-0.15
		-0.45(3)			-0.27	-0.06
^{123}Sb	$1g_{7/2}$	-0.49(5)	-0.74	-0.55	-0.25	-0.06

for nuclei ^{109,111}In and for all Sb isotopes. The rms value $< \delta\tilde{Q} >_{\rm rms}= 0.11$ b follows from the last column of Table 3. The corresponding value without PC corrections is significantly bigger, $< \delta Q >_{\rm rms}= 0.27$ b.

4. Conclusions

We developed a model of the self-consistent account of the PC corrections to quadrupole moments of odd semi-magic nuclei for the case where the odd nucleon belongs to the non-superluid component of the nucleus under consideration. The main ingredients of the calculation scheme are similar to that proposed recently by us for magnetic moments [14, 16]. The perturbation theory in g_L^2 is used, g_L being the vertex of creating the L-phonon. The main idea of our approach is to refuse from calculation of all terms proportional to g_L^2, as the main their part is taken into account implicitly in the EDF parameters we use. Instead, only such g_L^2 diagrams are separated and calculated explicitly which contribution fluctuates, depending on the nucleus under consideration and the state λ of the odd nucleon. The term δQ^Z due to the phonon Z-factor and the

one, δQ_{GGD}, due to the phonon-induced interaction are two main such terms. However, they always possess opposite signs and cancel each other significantly. Therefore two "small" corrections, the one, δQ_{GDD}, due to the phonon quadrupole moment and the non-diagonal "end term" $\delta Q'_{\rm end}$ are also often important. The sum of all four PC corrections to quadrupole moments of odd In and Sb isotopes, as a rule, improves agreement with experiment. For the sample of 18 nuclei we consider, the rms value of the difference between the theoretical predictions and experimental values is now $< \delta\tilde{Q} >_{\rm rms}= 0.11$ b, instead of the value of $< \delta Q >_{\rm rms}= 0.27$ b for the calculation without PC corrections.

The difference of $(1 - Z)$ is a measure of validity of the g_L^2 approximation. In nuclei we consider there are several cases with $Z \simeq 0.5$, which makes application of the perturbation theory in g_L^2 questionable. As it was discussed above, this occurs, as a rule, due to appearance of a "dangerous" term with small energy denominator in Eq. (10) for the PC correction to the mass operator Σ, and the analogous term arises synchronically in the correction δQ_{GGD} of the phonon-induced interaction. In the sum of these two terms, the inaccuracy becomes smaller then for each term separately which partially saves the approximation we use. However, a more consistent consideration is necessary of the dangerous cases, and this is in our nearest plans.

5. Acknowledgments

The work is supported with the Russian Science Foundation, Grants Nos. 16-12-10155 and 16-12-10161.

It was also partly supported by the RFBR Grants Nos. 14-02-00107-a, 14-22-03040_ofi-m, and 16-02-00228. We thank O. I. Achakovskiy for help. Calculations were partially carried out on the Computer Center of NRC "Kurchatov Institute".

References

[1] Litvinova E and Ring P 2006 *Phys. Rev.* C **73** 044328
[2] Cao Li-Gang, Colò G, Sagawa H and Bortignon P F 2014 *Phys. Rev.* C **89** 044314
[3] Tarpanov D, Dobaczewski J, Toivanen J and Carlsson B G 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** 252501
[4] Gnezdilov N V, Borzov I N, Saperstein E E and Tolokonnikov S V 2014 *Phys. Rev.* C **89** 034304
[5] Baldo M, Bortignon P F, Coló G, Rizzo D and Sciacchitano L 2015 *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Phys.* **42** 085109
[6] Ring P 1996 *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **37** 193
[7] Vautherin D and Brink D M 1972 *Phys. Rev.* C **5** 626
[8] Smirnov A V, Tolokonnikov S V and Fayans S A 1988 *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **48** 995
[9] Fayans S A, Tolokonnikov S V, Trykov E L and Zawischa D 2000 *Nucl. Phys. A* **676** 49
[10] Gnezdilov N V, Saperstein E E and Tolokonnikov S V 2014 *EPL* **107** 62001
[11] Gnezdilov N V, Saperstein E E and Tolokonnikov S V 2015 *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **78** 24
[12] Saperstein E E, Baldo M and Tolokonnikov S V 2016 *JETP Lett.* **103** 1
[13] Saperstein E E, Baldo M and Tolokonnikov S V 2016 *Phys. Rev.* C **93** 034302
[14] Saperstein E E, Kamerdzhiev S, Krewald S, Speth J and Tolokonnikov S V 2013 *EPL* **103** 42001

[15] Saperstein E E, Kamerdzhiev S, Krewald S, Speth J and Tolokonnikov S V 2013 *JETP Lett.* **98** 631
[16] Saperstein E E, Kamerdzhiev S, Krewald S, Speth J and Tolokonnikov S V 2014 *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **77** 1033
[17] Khodel V A and Saperstein E E 1982 *Phys. Rep.* **92** 183
[18] Migdal A B 1967 *Theory of finite Fermi systems and applications to atomic nuclei* (Wiley, New York).
[19] Fayans S A and Khodel V A 1973 *JETP Lett.* **17** 444
[20] Tolokonnikov S V and Saperstein E E 2010 *Phys. At. Nucl.* **73** 1684
[21] Tolokonnikov S V, Kamerdzhiev S, Voytenkov D, Krewald S and Saperstein E E 2011 *Phys. Rev.* C **84** 064324
[22] Tolokonnikov S V, Kamerdzhiev S, Krewald S, Saperstein E E and Voitenkov D 2012 *Eur. Phys. J.* A **48** 70
[23] Kamerdzhiev S, Krewald S, Tolokonnikov S V, Saperstein E E and Voitenkov D 2012 *Eur. Phys. J. Web of Conferences* **38** 10002
[24] Voitenkov D, Kamerdzhiev S, Krewald S, Saperstein E E and Tolokonnikov S V 2012 *Phys. Rev.* C **85** 054319
[25] Bohr A and Mottelson B R 1969 *Nuclear Structure, Vol. 1* (Benjamin, New York, Amsterdam).
[26] Gnezdilov N V, Borzov I N, Saperstein E E and Tolokonnikov S V 2014 *Phys. Rev.* C **89** 034304